

## REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present case. Claims 1, 6, 19, 22, 25, and 26 have been amended herein.

### 35 USC 102 (e) Rejection

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Narayanaswamy et al. (6,144,358). Applicant has reviewed the Narayanaswamy et al. reference and respectfully asserts that the claimed embodiments of the present invention are not anticipated by Narayanaswamy et al. for the following rationale.

Claim 1 includes the limitation "a first display component having multi-sided viewing functionality coupled to said front cover." Support for the multi-sided viewing functionality is found in the instant Specification. The rejection states that the above limitation is anticipated by Narayanaswamy et al. However, Applicant respectfully points out that Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or anticipate a display component having multi-sided viewing functionality as claimed.

More respectfully, Applicant respectfully states that Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation "a first display component having multi-sided viewing functionality coupled to said front cover." In contrast, Narayanaswamy et al. teaches the use of multiple different display screens, e.g., Figure 1B and Figure 4, however, each screen has but one viewing surface. This teaching is different from the multi-sided viewing

displays claimed in the present embodiment. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome, and that Independent Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claims 2 and 5 are dependent on Independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim and recite additional limitations.

#### 103(a) Rejections

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy et al. in view of Moscovich et al. (6,343,006). Applicant has reviewed Narayanaswamy et al. in view of Moscovich et al. and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 6 are not rendered obvious in view of Narayanaswamy et al. and Moscovich et al.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 6 includes the limitation “a first display component coupled to a front cover, the first display component having multi-sided viewing functionality.” Support for the multi-sided viewing functionality is found throughout the instant Specification. The rejection states that the above limitation is anticipated by Narayanaswamy et al. However, Applicant respectfully points out that Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or anticipate a display component having multi-sided viewing functionality. In contrast, Narayanaswamy et al. teaches the use of multiple different display screens, e.g., Figure 1B and Figure

4, however, each screen has but one viewing surface. This teaching is different from the multi-sided viewing displays claimed in the present embodiment.

Furthermore, Claim 6 includes the limitation "a second display component coupled to the palmtop computer system, the second display component having multi-sided viewing functionality." Again, Applicant respectfully points out that Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or anticipate a second display component having multi-sided viewing functionality as argued above. Furthermore, Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or anticipate a second display component coupled to the computer system at all.

With respect to Moscovich et al., Applicant respectfully states that Moscovich et al. do not render obvious the claimed invention nor do they remedy the shortcomings of Narayanaswamy et al. Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 6 includes the limitations "a first display component coupled to a front cover, the first display component having multi-sided viewing functionality," and "a second display component coupled to the palmtop computer system, the second display component having multi-sided viewing functionality." Applicant respectfully points out that Moscovich et al. do not teach nor anticipate either a first or a second display component having multi-sided viewing functionality. In contrast, while Moscovich may teach the use of multiple screens, e.g., Figure 27 and Figure 43A, nevertheless

each display screen is incapable of providing multi-sided viewing because each display screen taught has an opaque covered and cased back side. Therefore, Moscovich's display arrangement teaches away from the claimed display screen having multi-sided viewing functionality. Therefore, Moscovich et al. do not teach or render obvious the claimed limitations.

In addition, Applicant respectfully points out that since neither Narayanaswamy et al. nor Moscovich et al. teach or render obvious a multi-sided display, the combination of Narayanaswamy et al. and Moscovich et al. cannot possibly teach or render obvious a multi-sided display. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Narayanaswamy et al. do not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention. In addition, the combination of Narayanaswamy et al. and Moscovich et al. do not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 6. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and that Claims 7-18 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on Independent Claim 6 and reciting additional limitations.

#### Claims 19-20 and 25

Claims 19-20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy et al. in view of Kim (6,466,292). Applicant has reviewed Narayanaswamy et al. in view of Kim and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 19-20 and 25 is not anticipated or rendered obvious in view of Narayanaswamy et al. and Kim.

Claims 19 and 25 include the limitation “a flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality comprising a front display panel and a back display panel.” Applicant respectfully points out that Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or anticipate a flexible display component. In addition, Applicant respectfully points out that Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or anticipate a flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality because the displays taught are encased rendering them rigid.

With respect to Kim, Applicant respectfully states that Kim does not render obvious the claimed invention nor does he remedy the shortcomings of Narayanaswamy et al. Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 19 and 25 includes the limitations “a flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality comprising a front display panel and a back display panel.” Applicant respectfully points out that Kim does not teach or anticipate a flexible display component because Kim teaches an LCD which by nature is rigid. Therefore, Kim does not teach or render obvious the claimed limitation.

In addition, Applicant respectfully points out that since neither Narayanaswamy et al. nor Kim teach or render obvious a flexible multi-sided display, the combination of Narayanaswamy et al. and Kim cannot possibly teach or render obvious a flexible multi-sided display. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Narayanaswamy et al. do not teach or render

obvious the present claimed invention. In addition, the combination of Narayanaswamy et al. and Kim do not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 19 and 25. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 19 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome. In addition, Claims 20-21 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on Independent Claim 19 and reciting additional limitations.

Claims 22-23 and 26

Claims 22-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy et al. in view of Moscovich et al. and Kim. Applicant has reviewed Narayanaswamy et al. in view of Moscovich et al. and Kim and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 22-23 and 26 are not rendered obvious in view of Narayanaswamy et al., Moscovich et al., and Kim.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 22 and 26 include the limitation "a first flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality," and "a second flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality." Applicant respectfully points out that Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or anticipate a first flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality for the reasons presented above. Additionally, Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or anticipate a second flexible display component having multi-sided viewing

functionality. Furthermore, Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or anticipate a second flexible multi-sided display component at all.

With respect to Moscovich et al., Applicant respectfully states that Moscovich et al. do not render obvious the claimed invention nor do they remedy the shortcomings of Narayanaswamy et al for the reasons presented above. Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 22 and 26 includes the limitations "a first flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality," and "a second flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality." Applicant respectfully points out that Moscovich et al. do not teach nor anticipate either a first or a second display component having multi-sided viewing functionality. In addition, Moscovich et al. do not teach or render obvious a flexible display component. Therefore, Moscovich et al. do not teach or render obvious the claimed limitations.

In addition, Applicant respectfully points out that since neither Narayanaswamy et al. nor Moscovich et al. teach or render obvious a multi-sided display, the combination of Narayanaswamy et al. and Moscovich et al. cannot possibly teach or render obvious a multi-sided display

With respect to Kim, Applicant respectfully states that Kim does not render obvious the claimed invention nor does he remedy the shortcomings of Narayanaswamy et al. and Moscovich et al. Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 19 and 25 includes the limitations "a first flexible display

component having multi-sided viewing functionality,” and “a second flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality.” Applicant respectfully points out that Kim does not teach or anticipate a flexible display component. Additionally, Kim does not teach or render obvious both the first and the second multi-sided flexible displays.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Narayanaswamy et al. does not teach or render obvious the present claimed limitations “a first flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality,” and “a second flexible display component having multi-sided viewing functionality.” In addition, the combination of Narayanaswamy et al., Moscovich et al. and Kim do not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 22 and 26. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 22 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome. Additionally, Claims 23-24 are dependent on Independent Claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

#### References cited

The Applicant has reviewed the references which were cited but not relied on, and believes the present invention as claimed to overcome the references.

#### CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected Claims.



Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Date: 11/12/2003

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Anthony C. Murabito  
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060